DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 186 552 UD 020 551

AUTHOR Frye, Thomas M.: And Others
TITLE 1979 Evaluation Report--Title I.
INSTITUTION Community School District 23, Brooklyn, N.Y.
PUB DATE Jul 79
NOTE 51p.: Not available in paper copy due to light, broken print.

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Compensatory Education: Compliance (Legal); *Early Childhood Education: Educationally Disadvantaged; Elementary Education: *English (Second Language); Federal Programs: Junior High Schools; *Parent Participation; Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; *Remedial Mathematics; *Remedial Programs; *Remedial Reading
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; New York (Brooklyn)

ABSTRACT

This document evaluates a five component title I program supported by Community School District 23, Brooklyn, New York. The five components were (1) Mathematics Program for third through eighth graders; (2) Reading Laboratories Program for third through eighth graders; (3) Early Childhood Program for Kindergarten through second graders; (4) English as a Second Language Learning Centers for bilingual first through eighth graders; and (5) Parent Involvement Program designed to service parents of Title I students. Each program was evaluated through interviews and classroom observations to determine if funding guidelines were met. All components were found to be functioning according to guidelines, and recommendations were made for program recycling. Data collection instruments are included. (MK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

APR 2 9 1980

ED186552

1979 EVALUATION REPORT - TITLE I

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TO : NANCY SCOTT
DIRECTOR OF FUNDED PROGRAMS
COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT #23
FUNCTION NO. 5077-91620

FROM: THOMAS M. FRYE, FRYE &
ASSOCIATES, LIMITED
MORSLEY GUITTINGS
JEANETTE PARSONS

DATE: July, 1979

CE020551

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Ron Edmonds
NYC Bd of Ed
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CONTENTS

I OVERVIEW AND MANAGEMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION OF TITLE I PROGRAMS

II EVALUATION OF MATHEMATICS COMPONENT

III EVALUATION OF READING COMPONENT

IV DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

I Overview of Management's Implementation of Title I Programs

The administration, management and implementation of Title I Programs for Community School District #23 have been implemented according to guidelines. However, there remains evidence that the system could be monitored more uniformally. We've observed and discussed with building level managers (principals), teachers, and para professionals the strengths and weaknesses of the program. Overall the perception was favorable. Yet, there were recommendations which we believe would be beneficial to the district if implemented in the near future.

* Principals felt that they needed more administrative descretion to allow the program the flexibility necessary to service student needs.

* Principals felt that the rigidity of adherence to guidelines ties their hands.

* Principals felt that the mobility of targeted students was hindering the successful implementation of the program.

* Principals and building level resource persons felt that closer performance monitoring of the program could benefit the district.

* Vandalism and security appeared to be significantly harmful to the programs implementation.

* Resource teachers, paras and principals felt that consistent and on-going planning which allowed for "information gathering" sessions as opposed to "central board directive" type meetings would be more beneficial to program implementation.

* It was widely held by the principals that the duties and functions of the Family Assistant could be more specific .

* Title I personnel should not be administrative staff persons to building level managers.

* Based upon observations lab resource teachers could do more instruction as opposed to monitoring and supervision of paras.

* It was widely held that the tax levy teacher's role could be clarified regarding functions relevant to Title I programs.

Within this context, we believe that the system is "loosely coupled" and district wide conceptualization of specified observations above would be of use to next year's program implementation. Additionally, we believe that additional space should be allocated to the Director of Funded Programs (Title I) along with an assistant capable of handling some of the enormous tasks involved in the maintainence of the program. Nonetheless, we contend that the program should be refunded.

II Evaluation of Mathmematics Component

Function No. 5077 - 91624
4247

4247
4203

District 23 ESEA Title I

The PSEN/Title I Mathematics Program was conceptualized to improve the mathematical achievement of a selected group of students in grades 3-8 in Community School District 23 during the academic year 1978-1979. This program began during the 1976-1977 school year and has been recycled through the present year. All project sites are eligible for services under both funding sources and participants are identified accordingly on eligibility lists.

This program is primarily remediative in intent. Diagnostic-prescriptive measures were employed to facilitate the identification of specific skill areas where students evidence difficulties and/or deficits. Then the writing of prescriptions for each student to be administered through a step-wise management program. The Stanford Diagnostic Math Test Form A administered in September 1978 and April 1979 was used for pre-testing and post-testing.

It was proposed that the Mathematics Resource Teachers and the Educational Assistants could best assist students through the use of manipulative materials that progressed from the concrete to the abstract mode of thought in conjunction with small group and individualized instruction. In addition, there would be a strong emphasis on integrating everyday experiences with those skills developed in the classroom setting. Student-participants in the program received approximately 4 instruc-

tional periods per week of 45 minutes each period. At I.S. 271K participants were scheduled on the 60 minute period: 3 periods p/w x 60 minutes = 180 minutes. I.S. 55K was on modular scheduling of 20 minute modules. In all cases instructional time of 180 minutes p/w was met. The ratio of participants to adults was 5 to 8 in the elementary school and 8 to 12 in the intermediate school. The following records were mandated for each eligible student-participant in the program:

a. Daily attendance records.

b. Skills progress record cards.

c. Pupil reading profile card and test score cards or print-out sheets.

d. Eligibility lists with test scores.

e. Profile folders containing prescriptions and daily work.

f. Record of activities of Educational Assistants.

In the final evaluation 1977-1978 several recommendations were suggested for program improvement and efficiency. Some of these have been incorporated into plans for 1978-1979 school year. Others will be adopted as part of the implementation process for the current proposal. While others will again be offered for reconsideration and implementation during the next proposal.

Findings of Previous Evaluations and Their Implementation

1. Where there is an insufficient amount of eligible students as proposed for each school, classes should be paired and split to service the students based on their needs in the areas of reading and math.

   Findings:

   Only in one school this recommendation appears pertinent. The principal has already worked out a program to accommodate implementation.

2. Each school housing the ESEA Title I programs should be able to order materials according to their building needs based on input from the laboratory teacher.

Findings:

This recommendation has been implemented in all schools. Resource teachers with input from their educational assistants can prepare requisitions for hardware and software to meet their own unique building needs.

3. Guidelines of the proposal should be more flexible to address the needs of each individual school.

Findings:

There appears to be a difference in interpretation as to what is the intent of the federal guidelines and the flexibility of administrative discretion. This can usually be resolved with a telephone call to the Director of Funded Programs.

4. The Resource Teacher should monitor the instructional activities of the EAs in the classroom, as well as reinforcing the articulation input with the tax levy teacher during this time.

Findings:

This recommendation has been implemented in all schools. However, there seems to be some confusion in some schools as to what are "instructional activities." This could be corrected in either the preservice of inservice sessions and the adjustment reflected in logs that are submitted.

Present Findings

Administration and Implementation

There are approximately 2885 pupils, 21 Mathematics Resource Teachers and 43 Educational Assistants participating in the Title I and PSEN Mathematics Program, Grades 3-8 in 19 schools in Community School District 23. Interviews with Resource Teachers and Educational Assistants, and on-site observations of classes working in the Mathematics Laboratory give a very positive feeling and appraisal for the contributions the program was making to the school age children of District 23 who were in need of individualized help with mathematical skills and problems.

The mathematics program was implemented on time in all the

schools. In four (4) schools where the program was housed in small rooms there was overcrowding. This situation needs to be taken care of immediately if the program is to continue to function adequately in a small room. The approach in the elementary schools of assigning total classes of eligible students with their homeroom teachers to the Mathematics Laboratory is a very good one. It provides for (a) small group instruction and (b) it provides another trained staff member to assist with remediation. The District Mathematics Coordinator and the Title I Mathematics Coordinator are always available and are on immediate call to many schools whenever they are needed.

Facilities

Most of the classrooms housing Title I and PSEN Mathematics Programs are adequate and are very attractively decorated. In several schools where one large room is unavailable, two contiguous rooms are usually assigned for the program. The resource teacher and the tax-levy teacher will rotate the coverage of each room. In four schools the rooms designated for the Title I/ PSEN Mathematics Program are small. During the instructional program overcrowding and high noise level are very much in evidence. These factors detract from the efficacy of the program. Remedial action is indicated for the implementation of the 1979-1980 mathematics program.

In all the elementary schools the instructional periods were of a 45 minute duration. Total classes along with their homeroom teachers are usually scheduled for the instructional period. The non-eligible participants are usually grouped together for some kind of independent instructional activity. The eligibles are then divided into four (4) groups according to diagnosed need and the groups supervised by the two Educational Assistants, the Resource Teacher and the Homeroom Teacher. This arrangement appears to be working relatively well and should be incorporated in the next recycling of the program 1979-1980.

In the intermediate school the arrangement is a little different. The class arrives at the Mathematics Laboratory as part of the departmentalized program of the school without the subject or homeroom teacher. For instructional purposes, the class is divided into three groups, each group supervised by the two Educational Assistants and the Mathematics Resource Teacher.

Personnel

There are 21 Mathematics Resource Teachers and 43 Educational Assistants assigned to the Title I/PSEN Mathematics Pro-

gram in Community School District 23. Many teachers have had about three years of experience with the program. Programs of remediation, by design, possess difficult challenges in initiating and maintaining professional interest and motivation in the program.

It is suggested that a program of intervisitation and/or intra-visitation be instituted to help stimulate more interest, create new challenges and provide for the infusion of new thinking and new ideas which this program desperately needs if it is to remain viable and innovative.

Instructional Techniques, Organization and Procedures

The proposal states that "the Mathematics Laboratory component will provide instructional services to elementary and intermediate/junior high school students in grades 3 through 8. A criterion referenced-diagnostic prescriptive approach will be used to diagnose each student's specific remediation needs. Information yielded from indepth diagnosis of each student will be used for the formulation of individual prescriptions." In addition, "a variety of instructional materials and audiovisual aids will be employed to augment the mathematics program, and will be contained in designated/labelled areas within the laboratory. These aids will include cassette recorders, headphones/tapes; math skill builder games; manipulative materials; Innovative Science math materials".

Observations of classes in the Mathematics Laboratory suggested that the staff used the technique of one to one or small group instruction during the sessions. That there was a wide variety of educational hardware and software. That the techniques used by the staff were usually complemented by the use of audio-visual and visual manipulative materials, cassettes, tape recorders and an assortment of calculators.

Degree of Individualization

Observations of classes participating in the Mathematics Laboratory indicated that the approach used was primarily small group or one to one instruction supervised by the Mathematics Resource Teacher assisted by the Tax Levy Teacher and two Educational Assistants in the elementary school. In the intermediate/junior high school the approach is similar small group instruction supervised by the Mathematics Resource Teacher assisted by two Educational Assistants.

In some sessions participants worked individually with cal-

culators, tape recorders and audio-visual materials. In other sessions the technique was to demonstrate or teach a concept or skill for a part of the session. Then, the rest of the session was devoted to reinforcement activities. In still other sessions the activity was drill and skill work from workbooks.

Record Keeping

In the proposal, the records suggested for the program are as follows:

a. Daily Attendance Records

b. Skills progress record cards

c. Pupil reading profile card and test score cards or print-out sheets.

d. Eligibility lists with test scores.

e. Profile folders containing prescriptions and daily work.

f. Record of instrictional activities of Educational Assistants.

In all the schools visited individual records were maintained for each student. There were also program folders containing pupils work. In some folders work completed by students was not corrected, neither were the activities carefully monitored. Pre-service and in-service workshops and staff development sessions could be geared to deal with these inconsistencies.

The record of activities of Educational Assistants was maintained in all the schools. There is, however, some confusion as to the meaning of "instructional activities of Educational Assistants." The record as it exists in many schools comprises the identification of the various classes that attend the Mathematics Laboratory on a daily basis. Here again this is a matter that could be corrected in the Pre-service and In-service Workshops.

Some teachers suggest that record keeping is becoming overwhelming. It appears that the six suggested records could be streamlined into about three records. Probably this could be undertaken by the District Office and the prototype sent to individual schools for adaptation.

Materials

As far as could be ascertained very few schools received new materials for the 1978-1979 school year. Some schools still expect materials before the summer recess. Some schools have rich supplies of materials. But, most of them have been in the classrooms for several years. Hence, they are outdated. A few schools have been burglarized and some of the educational hardware has been stolen and/or vandalized. In some schools principals have used tax levy funds to supplement deficits.

In some schools calculators and audio-visual equipment are in need of repair and at present are totally useless to the conduct of the program. (There is need for a petty cash fund, or some other type of arrangement needs to be implemented so that the conduct of the program continues unimpeded.) There exists a District 23 set of Mathematics Objectives. These must be implemented by the schools. If these objectives are to be accomplished, the existing sets of materials in the schools must be (up-ated) and upgraded so that they become more consistent with and relevant to these objectives. There is need for an infusion of contemporary materials to keep the Mathematics Program viable and efficient.

Educational Assistants

There were 43 Educational Assistants assigned to the Title I and PSEN Mathematics Program. Two of them are assigned to each Mathematics Resource Teacher in the program. The Educational Assistants performed a variety of tasks under the direction of the Mathematics Laboratory Resource Teacher. These tasks included participation in various learning situations - small group, tutorial and monitoring of mathematics centers. The recording and updating of pupils' folders, correcting pupils work, and answering questions are also part of the role.

The Educational Assistants worked very closely with the Mathematics Resource Teachers. They participated in the Pre-service sessions. They actively participate in the monthly In-service sessions. Once per week they participate in staff development sessions with the Mathematics Resource Teacher. There exists an excellent relationship among the Educational Assistants and the Mathematics Resource Teachers.

Some Educational Assistants have graduated through the Career Ladder Program. Many are attending college working towards degrees. Others have no degrees and do not intend to obtain them. Many work excellently with students.

Others do not possess minimal skills and are sadly in need of instruction and remediation. Most of the training in mathematics skills, concepts and information is carried out by the Mathematics Resource Teacher through a program of on-the-job training. This is supplemented by attendance at the monthly in service workshop.

The selection of personnel to work in a remedial program of mathematics is a crucial task. The staff is very relevant to the efficiency and success of the program. It has been pointed out that when there are vacancies for Educational Assistants the jamor requirement is seniority. Hence seniority rather than qualifications become the basic requirement for teaching remedial mathematics. As admirable as this may be it does not help the efficiency of the program.

Staff Development

The purpose of the staff development program was to provide professional and paraprofessional staff opportunities to further develop their talents, skills, and techniques in this priority area for delivery of services to component participants. Two phases of staff development comprise the model: preservice and inservcie.

The preservice training was devoted to a review and reorientation of essential characteristics and design of the math laboratory: 1) structural arrangements, equipment, materials, personnel, laboratory management; 2) needs assessment of participants--initial testing and placement, diagnoses and prescription, and required record keeping; 3) establishment of communications networks among laboratory personnel, classroom teachers, building principals and staff and the math coordinator.

The preservice training was on-going during the 1st week of September 1978 and served as a preparatory period for reestablishment of laboratories, participant assignment, record retrieval, and promulgation of pretesting rosters according to the following schedule:

1st week: Overview of Title I guidelines/proposal
Reestablishment of math laboratories
Acquisition of participant assignments
Retrieval of participant records
Promulgation of eligibility rosters

Orientation visits to math laboratories of classes/students to refamiliarize participants with the utilization of the laboratories.

The inservice training was conducted from October 1978 through June 1979, on the second and third Wednesday of each month with the mathematics coordinator meeting with the professional staff from each site. It should be noted that the substance of the staff development sessions served as a basis for additional training which paraprofessionals received from laboratory teachers at their respective sites on a weekly basis. The intent of the staff development model was to produce a multiplier effect of training which will reach professional and paraprofessional program staff. Staff training was held from 1 PM to 3 PM on the designated Wednesday.

The mathematics proposal describes the roles of the Mathematics Resource Teacher and Educational Assistants as follows:

A. <u>The Mathematics Laboratory Teacher</u>

The math laboratory teacher will:

1. Have a strong background in math, and classroom management techniques.

2. Be responsible for the administration of ALL PRE-AND POST EVALUATIVE TESTING occuring in OCTOBER AND APRIL OF THE PROGRAM YEAR, and for the administration of ALL on-going interim instructional testing.

3. Develop appropriate prescriptions for each participant.

4. Record results of interim assessments and coordinate planning for development of future instructional steps with laboratory personnel.

5. Evaluate the instructional sequence and provide the students with feedback on their progress.

6. Be responsible for monitoring and giving instructional support to paraprofessionals assigned to the laboratory.

7. Such sessions will occur three Wednesdays of each month in the time slot identified for staff development. Familiarize the tax levy teacher when such personnel is

in the laboratory with techniques/approaches, management systems associated with the diagnostic/prescriptive approach.

8. Be responsible for setting up laboratories to receive participants and maintaining records/inventories of all reimbursable materials (including labelling of same).

9. Be responsible for maintaining all required site records for participants.

10. Maintain records for all staff development sessions.

B. The Educational Assistant

The paraprofessional will work in the math laboratory under the direction of the math lab teacher. Each paraprofessional will have an opportunity to assist in a variety of learning situations: a small group, tutorial, monitoring of math centers. In any cases where the paraprofessional is assigned to deliver a tutorial service to participants in a Tax Levy classroon the Math Lab Teacher with the assistance of the coordinator will discharge his/her duties in accordance with the frequency and total minutes per week previously described. The paraprofessional will assist the lab teacher with all facets of the laboratory operation, except the writing of student prescriptions. All paraprofessionals will be responsible for maintaining a record of their activities.

Information received from teachers and educational assistants suggest that the sessions - both pre-service and in-service have been very useful. Some teachers would like a little more teacher input into the planning of the various sessions. Some educational assistants believe that their cause would be better served if the monthly workshop is restructured. For example, the first 45 minutes to one hour be devoted to two mathematics seminars, one for teachers the other for educational assistants. The following forty-five minutes to an hour will be devoted to a colloquium or plenary session where both groups

will come together to discuss methodology, share ideas and plan for classroom implementation and the weekly staff development sessions in local schools.

The practice of inviting consultants to share their expertise is an excellent one, as long as the expertise is pertinent to the activities, philosophy, conduct and management of the program. It could also be useful for introducting new ideas and fresh thinking which this program so desperately needs if it is to remain fresh and innovative. There seems to be some confusion about diagnosis and prescription. In planning and developing the pre-service activity this concept should be given prime time. Granted that the pre-service workshop is conceptualized and geared to set the goals and tone of the project, discuss guidelines and the various issues relating to the project, this concept is of such magnitude that it must be dealth with.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Interviews with program staff, inspection of available records and on-site observations of classes functioning in the Mathematics Laboratory all combine to suggest that the Mathematics Program was implemented and is functioning according to the guidelines set out in the proposal. The organization of the Mathematics Laboratory, the instructional techniques used and the use of educational hardware and software are all consistent with a diagnostic-prescriptive approach.

Opportunities have been programmatically created for conferencing among the resource Teachers, Educational Assistants and Homeroom Teachers. This appears to be working well and some very valuable input is exchanged. However, there is only minimum communication among the Resource Teachers in the feeder elementary schools and the receiving intermediate and/or junior high school. This matter needs immediate attention. It may very well be that some staff development time could be devoted to this. Generally, the program is working very well and should be recycled and continued. The following recommendations are offered as a result of observations in this program.

III Evaluation of Title I Reading Laboratories Function #5077-91613

Description

The reading laboratories component in Community School district 23 is designed to provide supplemental remedial instruction in reading skills to students in the elementary and junior high schools of its catchment area. The program is to service approximately 3,200 students in grades 3-8. Students who are reading more than one year below grade level are eligible for the program. Whole classes are to be assigned to the lab.

Laboratory teachers are to use criterion referance diagnostic prescriptive approach to manage instruction. Said management system would allow for on going assessment and diagnostic teaching. Included in a criterion-referrance diagnostic prescriptive management system should be initial testing and placement, instructional assignments, interim testing, evidence of mastery and extended or new instruction based on evidence of mastery. With respect to record keeping, all eligible students are to be pre-tested, and post-tested with the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test. For all eligible students Lab Teachers should maintain an eligibility list, pre-tests scores, interim test scores, an attendance roster, and a pupil profile folder which should contain prescriptions and daily work.

Instructional materials and audio-visual equipment are to be used to facilitate instructions. Instruction is to be carried out on an individual and small groups basis.

Evaluation Procedure

Evaluation Objective: To determine the extent to which the program was implemented in accordance with the procedures des-

1. That each school housing the ESEA Title I and PSEN Programs should order materials according to the needs of their individual buildings based on input from the laboratory teacher.

2. That a program of intervisitation be implemented to help teachers learn new techniques and information and help keep themselves contemporary in the field of mathematics.

3. That the several items for record keeping be streamlined and combined into three or four items. This will make record keeping more realistic and manageable.

4. That there be an infusion of educational hardware and software particularly in the elementary school to make the existing inventories more contemporary and consistent with the Mathematics Objectives of Community School District 23.

5. That the guidelines of the proposal be more flexible to accommodate the needs of each individual school.

cribed in the funding proposals.

Methods and procedures: All Title 1 Reading Laboratory Teachers and Educational Assistances will be interviewed. Eighty-five perent of all reading laboratory classes will be observed.

Subjects: Reading laboratory classes and program personnel.

Data Analysis: Classroom observations and personal interview data will be analyzed and presented in narrative form.

Findings

Organization

Fifteen elementary and four junior high schools participated in the program. Total pupil enrollment was 2054. In all schools except 184K, entire classes were assigned to the reading laboratory. In the elementary schools the Lab Teachers taught either four classes five times a week, or five classes four times a week. At the junior high school level a more varied pattern prevailed. At 55K, which is on a module schedule, the laboratory teacher taught 7 classes for three one hour periods per week, at 271K, the Laboratory Teacher taught five classes for 1 hour four times a week. At 263K and 275K, length of instructional sessions were 45 minutes. With respect to 263K, the laboratory Teacher taught six classes five times per week. At 275K the laboratory teacher taught six classes four times per week.

In all instances students who were enrolled in the program were reading at least one year behind grade level. Due to entire classes being assigned to the reading lab, a few non-eligible students entered the lab. These students were given independent assignments by their tax levy teachers before they entered the reading lab and they worked independently on these assignments while in the reading lab. The program personnel included a reading coordinator who was located at the district office. At the building level, each elementary school had one laboratory teacher, except 155K which had two. At the junior high schools, 55K and 271K had one laboratory teacher each, 263K had two laboratory teachers and 275K had three laboratory teachers. There were 3-5 Teaching Assistants assigned to each Laboratory Teacher. In addition there were 1-2 family assistants attached to the Reading Labs.

Diagnostic Procedures

A criterion referenced diagnostic approach was utilized to manage instruction; Pre and Post-Standard Diagnostic Test Scores were available from all classes. Pre-test scores were used to form instructional groups. Instructional groups were mainly fixed homogeneous groups with cross grouping ocurring.

Once placed in an instructional group, students were given various informal tests to ascertain more detail skill needs. Said information was recored on ICRT folders, or teacher made recording devices (All students had individual folders in which their prescriptions and a collection of work in progress or completed were found).

Instruction:

Curriculum instruction was conducted in small groups, namely 5-7 students each, as well as independent assignments and when appropriate , whole group lessons. No more than twenty-five students were observed in the labs.

All classes, except at 271k, were divided into learning stations. The most commonly named learning stations were:

Comprehension
Audio Visual
Phonic and Structural Analysis
Language Analysis
Vocabulary Development
Testing
Quiet Study/Library/Independent Study

Instructional groups remained in stations for 1-4 days, depending on school policy. Learning stations were manned by Lab Teachers and Educational Assistants in the following manner:

A. Lab teachers and educational assistants manned the same stations or periodically changed stations..Groups of students travelled independently to stations.

B. Educational assistants were assigned to a group of students. Students with their permanently assigned EA's would rotate to different stations. Once at the station, the EA assigned to the group would conduct the lesson using the station's materials.

The EA's taught small group lessons, supervised independent work and tutored on an individual basis. The Tax Levy Teacher's function's varied. In many schools, s/he functioned as an addi-

tional member of the instructional team. In a few schools, the tax levy teacher worked exclusively with the non-eligible students.

The reading lab teacher was the staff member in charge. Her responsibilities were to:

a) train para-professionals to use resource materials
b) supervise para-professionals
c) develop individual student prescriptions
d) teach small group sessions
e) administer individual group testing

Materials found in predominance were as follows:

Support reading skills
S.R.A.
Comic Book Reading Skills materials
Loft-Skill Development
Skill Pacers
Skills Reservoir
Classroom Reading Clinic
BFK Reading Skills
Random House Reading Program
Bench Mark Skill Development

The vast majority of the rooms were equipped with audio visual supplies. The lab teacher in general felt the materials were adequate and had utility. Most teachers expressed a need for more low level reading comprehension material. Most EA's expressed a need for materials that developed specific skills.

Personnel

The program persomnel which included, lab teachers, educational assistants and family workers appeared to work well. However, the role of the family workers lacked consistent clarity.

The lab teachers felt their educational assistants were well trained and performed sufficiently. Yet, most lab teachers concurred that additional training of their educational assistants would enhance the instructional activities. It was also noted that any training sessions for the EA's should take into account the varied backgrounds.

Communication between the tax levy teachers and the lab teachers was on going and effective at the elementary level. At the junior high level, the lab teachers and the tax levy teachers met informally when common preparation periods were not scheduled. Lab teachers met with their EA's on Wednesday afternoons for staff training and curriculum planning. Lab teachers had monthly training sessions at the district office. These sessions were conducted by the reading coordinator. Some principals felt the many responsibilities of the coordinator prevented her from monitoring more closely the reading labs.

DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

Facilities

In general, classroom facilities were more than adequate. Most schools utilized two rooms for their reading program. Rooms were arranged to promote independent and group activities and to facilitate the different stations. All rooms were attractively decorated with commerical or teacher made materials. The children's work was not copiously displayed.

Last Year's Recommendations

1. Where there is an insufficient amount of eligible students as proposed for each school, classes should be paired and split to service the students based on their needs in the areas of reading and math?

Findings

At PS184k classes were paired and split to maximize the number of students serviced. For the other schools in the district maintaining eligibility quotas were not a problem.

2. Each school housing the ESEA Title I program should be able to order materials according to their building needs based on input from the lab teacher.

Findings

Lab teachers were able to have in-put in ordering materials They usually gave their requests for materials to the district coordinator and she ordered the materials and had them distributed to the schools.

3. In the IS?JHS there should be time allotted for the language arts teacher to confer with the laboratory teacher.

Findings

Principals at the secondary level made a concerted effort to schedule mutual preparation periods for language arts and lab teachers. However, some logistical inconsistencies are still evident.

4. More intensified training sessions are needed for the lab teacher and educational assistants.

Findings

Wednesday afternoons were set aside for staff training. Staff training took the form of seminars, demonstration lessons, workshops and book fairs.

This Year's Recommendations

1. It is recommended that a two folded training program be implemented for the Educational Assistants:
   a. Training of EA's by district level or other appropriate personnel in the Philosophy and Methods of Teaching Reading
   b. Training of EA's by lab teachers in the utilization of reading materials in the lab.

2. It is recommended that more varied materials be utilized. These materials should address themselves to larger units of reading instruction. The present materials were mainly teaching kits that emphasized specific skill development.

3. It is recommended that the reading lab in 275k be moved to a larger room, the present classroom is not adequate.

4. It is recommended that a larger portion of the lab teachers time be devoted to concept development through teacher directed lessons.

5. It is recommended that students' work be exhibited in the classrooms and other appropriate places in the school buildings.

6. It is recommended that clarification is needed on the format the EA's should use to report their instructional activities.

7. It is recommended that a uniform management system be developed that one, diagnoses pupil skill needs, two, reports individual pupil skill needs and evidence of masteryand three, reports group or class skill needs and evidence of mastery.

8. It is recommended that district wide reading objectives be established.

9. It is recommended that existing materials be coded into district wide reading objectives.

Conclusion

The ESEA Title I Reading Laboratories were found to be adequate ly following the guidelines of the funded proposal. As evidenced by evaluators' impressions and statistical analysis of student progress.
It is recommended that the program be re-cycled upon incorporating the recommendations stated.

3. What other problems do you have in implementing or maintaining the Title I programs in this building (district) ?

4. What type of help would you like that you don't recieve now?

5. Has the articulation input network necessary for the effective implementation of the Title I program been developed between the tax levy teacher, resource teacher and paras? Explain.

6. Has a set of standardized objectives for the Title I programs been established and utilized in this building? Was it effective? Explain.

7. Are those eligible Title I students recieving reinforcement and supplementary instruction as a result of the paraprofessional assistance? Explain.

8. Has material for program usage been discussed amongst all Title I program personnel? Have these discussions been useful? Explain.

9. Have the resource teachers monitored the instructional activities of the para's in the classroom as well as coordinate with the tax levy teachers? What was the results of this effort?

10. What are the total number of students participating in the Title I programs in this building?

INTERVIEW OUTLINE

Instructions To Interviewer

The interview is designed to be open ended and free flowing. It has been developed around the recommendations included in the 1978/1979 Title I Proposal for this School District. Try to be as unstructured as possible as long as it is productive. This list of questions in no way should impede you as the interviewer from conducting a free flowing session with the interviewee. All answers should be from their point of view.

Opening Statement by Interviewer

As you know, my colleagues and I are conducting the evaluation efforts for this school district's Title I/PSEN Programs. Many persons such as yourself in the district will be interviewed. We view our role as a resource to you and in order to be most helpful we need to find out your needs: what you see as the strengths and weaknesses of the Title I Program in this building and/or the district as a whole. Therefore, we are spending a bit of time talking personally with a number of key individuals such as yourself.

All right. Now, I'd like to learn as much as possible about how this program operates. Whatever you tell me will be confidential. Before we begin, is there anything you'd like to ask me?

Principal ( ) Teacher ( ) Paraprofessional ( ) Coordinator ( )

Parent ( ) Other ( ) (Please Check One)

Name of Interviewee _____
School _____
Date ___/___/_____

1. What were your impressions of the Title I Programs last year? Has it changed?

2. With whom do you come into contact with in terms of implementing the Title I Programs in this building? What are these relationships like? What problems do you have with them?

11. What are the total number of teachers and paraprofessionals involved in the Title I programs in this building?

12. Have parents been involved in the Title I programs in this building? Explain.

13. What has been your role in terms of incorporating the parents skills and resources with the Title I programs?

14. If the Title I programs in this building were a person what type of person would it be?

15. Suppose you were the head of the district and responsible for planning long range for the Title I programs, what are the most important things to consider?

16. How do you see the future of the Title I programs in the district?

17. What recommendations do you have to further enhance the Title I programs in this building?

18. Suppose this district had to stop some of the things it now does with respect to the Title I programs, what should be changed?

3. Mode of instruction:
   ( ) discussion
   ( ) lecture
   ( ) audio visual
   ( ) independent work
   ( ) other
4. Quantity of materials:
   ( ) abundant
   ( ) adequate
   ( ) insufficient
5. Building facilities: (lighting,ventilation, etc)
   ( ) excellent
   ( ) good
   ( ) fair
   ( ) poor
6. Type of materials being used;
   ( ) teacher made
   ( ) text books
   ( ) games & activities
   ( ) teaching kits
   ( ) other
7. Are any parents involved in any classroom activies:
   ( ) yes
   ( ) no
8. Are displays, bulletin boards and other outlets observable which depict the students creativity or performance:
   ( )yes
   ( )no
9. Are there other observable conditions which merit discussion that has not been included in this protocol? Explain.

10. Total number of sessions per week ( ) and length of sessions ( )

_____ (SIGNATURE)

OBSERVATION PROTOCOL

SCHOOL_____

DATE __/__/____

TEACHER_____

PROGRAM:

READING_____ EARLY CHILDHOOD_____

MATH_____ OTHER_____

INTERVIEWER_____

RECORDS

DAILY ATTENDANCE_____

SKILLS PROGRESS RECORD CARDS_____

PUPIL READING(MATH) PROFILE CARD____

TEST SCORE CARDS/PRINT OUT SHEETS____

PSEN STUDENTS____TITLE I STUDENTS_____OTHER_____

STAFF PRESENT AND NUMBER ( ) TEACHER ( ) PARAPROFESSIONAL ( )

TOTAL NUMBER OF PUPILS PRESENT_____

TOTAL NUMBER OF PUPILS ON REGISTER_____

/

1. Type of instructional grouping
   - ( ) Small Group
   - ( ) 1 - 7 students
   - ( ) 8 - 15 students
   - ( ) Whole class
2. Staff member in charge
   - ( ) Teacher
   - ( ) Paraprofessional

19. Do you have problems with facilities or equipment?

_____

_____

20. Have members of this buildings Title I staff visited other school districts to ascertain additional innovative ideas or instructional aids? What has been the result?

_____

_____

_____

21. I've asked many questions, thinking over them for a moment have I not asked you something which you would like to discuss with me?

_____

_____

_____

_____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME

PERSONAL OBSERVATIONS OF INTERVIEWEE:

_____
SIGNATURE

CONTENTS

EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT	5077-91622
ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE	5077-91625
PARENT INVOLVEMENT	5077-91626

The following evaluations were compiled by the inhouse evaluation personnel with the assistance of the consultants who accomplished the evaluation of the management, mathematics and reading components.

The Title I Early Childhood Program was developed to provide supplemented remedial assistance in the areas of reading and mathematics for a selected group of students in grades K-2 in C.S. District 23 during School year 1979-80. This program commenced during school year 1976-1977 and was recycled through the 1978-79 school year.

I. The Instructional Design

A. The instructional design which was used in the kindergarten, first and second grade was demonstrated in a program with educational assistants assigned to classes on a "full time" basis. The method used within the classroom involve the educational assistants in small group and individual instruction. All instruction was in the areas of reading and mathematics. Since language development is an important pre-requisite to proficiency in reading and mathematics, instruction focused on providing opportunities for meaningful language experiences. Reading and mathematics skills were integrated to provide experiences on a functional level.

Reading/Language Arts areas covered were as follows:

I. Vocabulary-word recognition and word meaning
II. Word Analysis - phonics, structural analysis and word form clues
III. Perceptive Skills - auditory and visual skills
IV. Comprehension - interest, ability, association of ideas of materials read, organization of ideas, locating information, appreciation
V. Oral and Silent Reading Skills - Oral expression, oral and silent reading
VI. Speaking - expressing ideas, conversation, discussion and storytelling
VII. Reading and Literature -picture books, short stories, storybooks, folktales and poetry
VIII. Written Expression - dictation writing stories and poetry

Mathematics

The educationa assistant focused on mathematics skills through use of manipulative materials progressing from concrete to abstract thought. A strong emphasis was placed on integrating every day experience with those skills developed in the classroom setting. The following were the areas of instruction in mathematics:

I. Number and numeration -counting, reading and writing
II. Sets - language and symbols
III. Operations on whole numbers -processing of numerals, addition, subtraction, multiplication and division
IV. Operations on fractions - processing of fractions
V. Problem solving
VI. Geometry and measurement

Diagnostic-prescriptive measures were employed for instruction to facilitat the identification of specific skill areas where students evidence, and the writing of prescriptions through a step-wise management system.

B. Educational assistants delivered services to students 4 to 5 times per week on a graduated period basis. Note the following scheduling factors:

1. Kindergarten periods -due to half-day scheduling were measured in 20 minute blocks of time. Therefore students at this grade level received services ten times per week (5 periods reading/ 5 periods math) for a total of 200 minutes per week.

2. Grade 1 periods were measured in 30 minute blocks of time. Therefore students at this grade level received service ten times per week (5 periods reading/5 periods math) for a total of 300 minutes per week.

3. Grade 2 periods were measured in 30 minute blocks of time. Therefore students at this grade level received services 10 times per week for a total of 300 minutes per week.

a) Materials such as the following were used to facilitate instruction: Unifics blocks, Cuisenaere rods, a variety of math manipulatives, the Piper Program (Readers Digest), Language Experience in Reading, (Brittanica Encylcopedia) Durrell-Murphy, and Mainstream. This listing is suggestive but not exhaustive of the types of materials utilized.

b) The ratio of participants to adult was from four (4) to six pupils in each instructional group.

c) The following records were kept for each child designated as Title I eligible daily attendance records, skills progress record card, pupil reading profile card and test score cards or printout sheers. These records used in conjunction with any devices used by the classroom teacher.

2. Staff

a) INSTRUCTIONAL

The Early Childhood paraprofessional worked in the classroom delivering services to Title I eligible students. The tax levy teacher and paraprofessional established the schedule for these services. The paraprofessional will work with youngsters in reading and math on a small group and individualized basis and his/her time was equally divided between the tow priority areas. Teacher written prescriptions (by the resource teacher) provided the basis for the paraprofessionals' operation. All paraprofessionals kept a written record of their activities.

1. Classroom teachers had the opportunity to discuss placement, and instruction all assignments of their students with Title I staff.
2. Classroom teachers had an opportunity to exchange ideas for further reinforcement of skills regarding their youngsters.
3. Classroom teachers had an opportunity to advise, Title I staff of the students status/progress in the basis instruction area of reading, and math, thereby coordinating all aspects which relate to reporting of students' grades.
4. Classroom teachers and Title I staff had an opportunity at least twice each year, to meet with the parents of Title I participants.

SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

The family assistants/family workers were used to augment the Title I program in this component in the following manner:

i Direct Services by F/W F/A to the Instruction of Project Participants

i.i. Attending to the physical needs of participants and providing management assistance to the project teacher on neighborhood field trips planned in line with the priorities.

1.2. Assisting participants, under the supervision of the project teacher, with homework assignments, as bringing to absent pupils assignments in reading and math from the project teacher; furnishing necessary texts, workbooks, etc., returning completed work to the teacher for correction and further followup assignments for the absentee.

1.3. Providing the project teacher with information obtained from the home about participant such as a language other than English being used exclusively in the home, which will assist the teacher in the development of appropriate learning experiences.

1.4. Assisting in the development of instructional materials by bringing to the project teacher information about the cultural background of the family and furnishing translation service in the home/school.

2. Supportive Services by Family Workers/Family Assistants to the Instruction of Project Participants

2.1. Acts as foreign language interpreter and translator among the professional staff, parent and pupils during individual parent/pupil/teacher conference. Acts in conveying information between parents and the schools, as available remedial services in the community of an educational nature.

2.2. Provides information to parents of participants to meet needs of participants and about the project activities.

2.3. Provides information to project staff which was obtained from the home in order to assist in pupil project registration and placement.

2.4. Helps conduct needs assessment relative to eligible pupils in the participant selection process by visiting the home to obtain basic data and relaying it to project personnel.

2.5. Participates in parent workshops, under the direct supervision of the professional staff by serving as an interpreter, explaining procedures and educational facilities available to children in relation to the priorities, presenting materials, etc.

2.6. In coordination with regular attendance programs and under professional supervision, visits home or project participants to ascertain causes of absences and has a follow-up with teachers and supervisors as the case may be.

Family Workers/Family Assistants assigned to the E.C.D. Component delivered services as outlined above to participants in coordination with the Resources Teachers, and paraprofessionals. In addition, FA's/FW's assisted with and participated in parent workshops which were coordinated by the resource teachers.

C. Staff Development

The prupose of the staff development program was multifold, providing: Paraprofessional staff opportunities to further develop their talents, skills, and techniques in this priority area for delivery of services to participants; Resource Teachers retooling opportunities as well as input into curriculum assessment and/or revision; more formalized articulation between tax levy and Title I personnel for the purpose of more efficciently coordinating the delivery of instructional and supportive services to participants of this component. One week was set aside at the beginning of the program for meetings, conferencing and organizing. The educational assistants met as a group with the Title I Coordinator and were then directed to meet in smaller groups with the Resource Teacher assigned to their school. The remaining time was programmed for organizing class lists, records, and setting up the resource rooms for the school year, additional needs assessments as necessary, required recordkeeping.

Inservice staff development for resource teachers were held on the second Wednesday of each month October, 1978 - June 1979 inclusive. During this period agenda topics included but were not limited to: intra-district visitation, inter-district visitation, development of teacher-made materials, child development: psychological and developmental processes, innovative methods and utilization of materials for delivery of services, small group management, affective domain concepts: self-awareness, pupil-pupil and pupil-paraprofessional interactions and their relationship to growth in reading and mathematics.

As other needs were identified during the course of the program year, they were included on the staff development agenda. This explication and the information supplied on training under the resource teachers' functions/duties (FA-50) combine to form the staff development approach for this component.

On the remaining Wednesdays of each month, the resource teachers devoted staff development time to assisting the paraprofessionsls as indicated in the section on the purpose of staff training. Content of these sessions were a combination of information gleaned from the resource teachers own staff development sessions as sell as those aspects/needs of the paraprofessionals identified in the instructional environment.

NOTE: The coordination of parent workshops are part of the duties of the resource teacher in this component. However, in many instances Title I staff in other components, e.g. reading, mathematics, ESL; from time-to-time lent their expertise and participated as was the case in the 1977-78 program. The content of the parent workshops continued to focus on the vital needs of: Early Childhood Development and the role of the family - Health/Nutrition - Career and Job Opportunities.

The Workshops in all cases continued to reflect the needs of the parents and were flexibly scheduled accordingly.

The Title I Early Childhood Coordinator, Ms. Inez Johnson, conducted staff development sessions for this component. Ms. Johnson possesses an Early Childhood license; ability in addition to eleven years teaching experience.

LAST YEAR'S RECOMMENDATIONS

Several recommendations were made in the 1977-78 final evaluation for program improvement. Some were incorporated into the plans for the current proposal while others will be reconsidered and offered for implementation in the next recycling.

Findings of Previous Evaluations and Their Implementation:

1. Before the onset of the 1978-79 academic year, emphasis on the articulation input necessary for effective implementation of the ECD Program should be developed between the tax levy teacher, resource teachers and EA's at the staff development sessions. All information pertinent to the ECD program should be disseminated to all personnel involved indirectly with the effectuation of the program.

Findings

This recommendation was partially implemented in the project schools. More needs to be done in staff development sessions for total implementation.

2. For all proposed sites housing the ECD program in Community School District #23, a specified set of standarized objectives should be established and utilized.

Findings: This recommendation was implemented in all schools. A set of objectives has been developed centrally and distributed to the schools for adaptation and implementation.

3. Information pertaining to the implementation of the principal of grouping within the classroom to accomodate students should be provided for the tax levy teacher. Each group that is established by the resource teacher according to students' specified needs should rotate within the realm of the classroom. In summation, the students would be receiving reinforcement and supplementary instruction from the EA's concommitant with basic provided by tax levy teacher.

Findings: This recommendation has been partially implemented in the project schools. More needs to be done with this concept in staff development sessions.

4. Input in terms of suggestive materials for program usage should be discussed among all personnel in the ECD component at the end of the 1977-78 academic year.

Findings: This recommendation has been implemented in all the project schools.

5. The Resource Teacher should monitor the instructional activities of the EA's in the classroom, as well as reinforcing the articulation input with the tax levy teacher during this time.

Findings: This recommendation has been implemented in all of the project schools. However more development of the recommendation is needed in staff development sessions.

Present Findings and Recommendations

1. Administration and Implementation

There are approximately 2706 pupils, 14 Resource Teachers, 104 Educational Assistants and 14 Family Workers/Assistants participating in the Early Childhood Program - Grades K-2 in 14 schools in Community School District 23. Interviews with principals, conferences and conversations with resource teachers and educational assistants suggest that the program has been implemented according to the guidelines suggested in the proposal. Visits to the resource rooms in the various project schools also suggest that the program is working.

The Early Childhood Program was implemented on time in the 14 project schools. The resource rooms visited are all large and adequate. There is available at all times an assortment of curricular materials in reading and mathematics. The approach of the classroom teacher making the diagnosis, the resource teacher preparing the prescription and the educational assistant under the supervision of the resource teacher carrying out the prescription seems to be working. However, some staff development work is needed in the area of Human Relations. Also, there is need for developing techniques for using input as classroom teachers, resource teachers and educational assistants continue to collaborate in the program. The Early Childhood Coordinator is always available to give assistance where needed.

In Kindergarten classes the periods are 20 minutes long. Pupils receive services 200 minutes per week, 100 minutes each in reading and mathematics. In levels one and two the periods are 30 minutes long. Pupils receive services 300 minutes per week 150 minutes each in reading and mathematics. This arrangement appears to be working well and should be incorporated in the next recycling of the program.

Record Keeping

In the proposal the records suggested for the program are as follows:

(a) Daily attendance records.
(b) Skills progress record card
(c) Pupil reading profile card and test score cards or printout sheets.
(d) Educational Assistant's records of activities.

Records were maintained for each student in the 14 project schools. There were also records for the educational assistants working in the classrooms. It was difficult to monitor the activities of the educational assistants since the record showed only a number rather than the description of any activity. This needs some clarification and should be worked on in the Staff Development sessions. Some attention and some careful thought needs to be given to item (c) above.

Materials

Most of the resource rooms visited had ample supplies of instructional materials. The materials are supplement by additional materials prepared by the resource teachers and the educational assistants. There now exists a district set of objectives for the Early Childhood Program. All newly acquired materials, both hardware and software should be selected to make the materials in the resource rooms consistent with the attainment of the district objectives.

Conclusion

The early childhood component in Community School District #23 was found to be functioning at an adequate level. Additional work is needed in some areas as recommended above. However, we find that this component of the Title I package should be recycled.

English As a Second Language
Learning Centers

Program Description

The Title I ESEA ESL Learning Center Component was to be implemented in one school in Community School District #23. That was P.S. 155. The target population was to consist of 135 bilingual students from grades one through eight.

The following facets of the English Language Arts were to be addressed by the ESL Learning Center: listening and viewing, speaking reading, writing, and independent study. Students were to be pretested and posttested with the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test(SDRT) and on the basis of students performance they were to be provided with individual and small group instruction.

The participant to staff ratio was to be six to eight students per staff member. One bilingual teacher and two paraprofessionals were to be employed in the ESL Centers. Five bilingual teachers were to be employed under a funding service other than Title I. In P.S. 155, whole class groups of eligible students were to visit the Center accompanied by their Tax Levy teacher. Students were to be scheduled for the ESLCenter at a mininimum total of 180 minutes per week.

Eligibility was to be based on all spanish surnamed students who were administered the English version of the Language Assessment Battery (LAB) and achieved scores at or below the twentieth percentile.

All project sites were to maintain: (1) eligibility lists with LAB scores/interim test, (2) attendance rosters, and (3) folders containing diagnoses/prescriptions and daily work.

The bilingual teacher was to be responsible for performing the following duties: (1) Group and schedule students in conjuction with Tax Levy teachers and school supervisors.

(2) develop appropriate prescriptions for each participant.

(3) record results of interim assessments and coordinate planning for development of future instructional steps with laboratory personnel.

(4) evaluate the instructional sequence and provide the students with feedback on their progress.

(5) monitor and provide instructional support to paraprofessionals assigned to the center.

(6) hold regular in-lab training sessions for paraprofessionals in techniques and processes related to delivery of bilingual service.

(7) familiarize the tax levy teacher when such personnel is in the laboratory with techniques and processes related to delivery of bilingual services.

(8) be responsible for setting up laboratories to receive participants and maintaining records/inventories of all required site records for participants.

(9) maintain records of all staff development sessions.

The paraprofessional was to work in the ESL center under the direction of the bilingual teacher. Each paraprofessional was to assist in learning situations, small group and tutorial. All paraprofessionals were to be responsible for maintaining a record of their activities.

Coordination was to be established with the classroom teacher and the Title I staff. In P.S. 155 classroom teachers were to assist their students in instructional activities in the center setting.

The LAB Coordinator was to have the responsibility to assist the Director of Funded Programs in monitoring this component and to plan and conduct monthly staff development sessions for center personnel.

The LAB Coordinator was also to visit center sites, provide on-site assistance, coordinator ordering and distribution of materials, and coordinate the smooth integration of this component with other bilingual and funded programs within the district.

Two phases of staff development were to be implemented: preservice and inservice. The perservice training was to be devoted to a review and reorientation of essential characteristics and design of the ESL learning centers. The inservice training was to be conducted once monthly from October, 1977 to June, 1978.

The State Education Department approved the administration of the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test. See table 4 for the evaluation design and the sections of the test that will be administered. The items in the subtest will be grouped according to the State Eduaction Department Evaluation Unit's Classification of Instructional Mastery in Reading. The grouping will be done by the Reading Coordinator. Title VII Resource Bilingual Teacher, with the assistant coordinator of Evaluation serving as the monitor, will meet to develop a consensus for classifying each item. For the proposed data analysis, the average across the national percent passing the item groupings will serve as mastery. The data for Title I students serviced will be reported separately.

Evaluation

Observations and interviews reveal that the Title I ESL Learning Centers component is presently operating the designated School. All spanish surnamed students possessing eligibility requirements are presently being serviced in the program component. One hundred and thirt-five students were serviced. At P.S. 155 whole classes are being serviced in the Centers with the accompainment of the Tax Levy teachers.

All Centers are divided into stations as described in the proposal. In most cases the Centers could be classified as being adequate. The majority of the materials that are being incorporated in the structure of the classroom require students to work independently or in small groups with the teacher's assustabce. As a result of the program receiving late approval, materials for the 1978-79 year were not delivered. At all project sites eligibility lists, attendance records, and student folders were maintained by teachers.

The SDRT was administered in October, 1978 to all students in the component. prior to the administration of the pretest, a workshop was held by the District's Office of Funded Programs for teachers and paraprofessionals.

Administration proceedures were discussed as well as the type of scoring reports that will be employed in the component. P.S. 155, because students' progress (on a regular basis.)

The ESL Learning Centers appear to be operating with relatively few problems. The Teacher observed demonstrated a great deal of creativity in lessons prepared, and the utilization of teacher made materials. Lesson plans are present in the classroom along with students folders that contain student instructional prescriptions. In most case the teacher prepared informal tests to diagnose students' deficiencies.

In interviews with the building principal and ESL teacher, the consensus was that problems were met in encouraging parents of Title I eligibles to be serviced in the ESL Learning Centers component. Parents fear that students would be tracked in a program that would prevent their assimilation into the Schools non-hispanic student population. Parents took the option of placing their children in the Tax Levy Bilingual classrooms instead of Title I classes. Title I staff and the building principal coordinated their efforts to contact parents of Title I ESL eligible and inform them of the educational benefits that their children would gain as a result of attending these classes. They met with much success.

Summary

The ESL Learning Center operated as a proposed and the component's evaluation objectives should be relized, Steps must be taken, however, to insure that for the next academic year the component has someone to oversee its operation. Although ESL instructional staff seem to be functioning well, it seems that an inordinate amount of responsibility is placed on them in the absense of a coordinator.

Recommendations

The following are recommendations designed for the improvement of the ESL Learning Centers Component:

1. It would be advantageous with the absence of an ESL coordinator, to allow ESL instructional staff to attend workshops given by other Bilingual Programs in the district.
2. For the 1978-79 year of the program every effort should be made to hire a coordinator for this component.
3. In September, the principal with the assistance of the ESL coordinator, and ESL instructional staff, should disseminate to all ESL Title I eligible students and their parents information to this component. This would encourage parents to allow their children to pa.ticipate in the learning Centers.

Parent Involvement Component

Program Description

The Title I Parent Involvement Component was designed to service the parents of all Title I students in Community School District 23. The component was designed to meet the educational needs of the District 23 community. The staff was to consist of one Parent Program Assistant (PPA) who was to be assigned to the 20 schools in the district. The PPA was to be employed by the Parent Involvement Component, while the FW/FA were to be employed by the Title I Early Childhood, Reading, and Math Components. The duties of the FW/FA were to be as follows:

Academic Activities

The FW/FA were to provide limited tutorial services to Title I students toward the improvement of their educational deficiencies. These services were not to supplant the regularly scheduled Title I instructional services, but were designed to be a supplemental instructional resource to students in the Title I Program. FW/FA were also to meet with the parents of eligible and/or participating students on a regular basis. Parents were to be introduced and/or familiarized with the various services which their children received. Moreover, instruction germane to methods and techniques by which parents can supplement instruction at home was also to be delivered. The FW/FA were to be assisted by Coordinators of the instructional components and by arrangement, presentations were to be scheduled. Laboratory teachers were to be invited to share in the various parent activities on a volunteer basis.

Parent Volunteer Groups

The Parent Involvement Staff was to recruit parent volunteers in each of the project sites. Training was to be provided for all types of parent involvement. The staff was to consult with the building principal, who was to assess the parent involvement needs of their school. A check off list of interest and willingness to participate in the component was to be sent home with each participating student. Activity clusters were to be firm, based upon parent response. The staff was to work closely with parents to establish a parent volunteer corps whose major thrust was in the recruitment and mobilization of greater parent involvement. A parent room was to be established in each school. Library resources were to be provided for parents use, relevant to a variety of subjects related to education. Provisions were to be made to establish a lending library for parents and opportunities provided for parents to share ideas and concerns which may be an outgrowth of their readings and other experiences. The parent involvement staff was to assist the building principal in coordinating the monthly Title I School Advisory Council (SAC) meeting. The staff was to report on the school's status regarding the parent involvement component of the Title I Program. They were to share with the SAC, the opinions, reactions and recommendations of parents as related to their participation in academic activity, and parent volunteer sections of the program.

A Parent Liaison was to be hired with specific duties encompassing the following: To encourage parents and the community to develop programs for parents, family activities, and special interest; to serve as liaison with school, parents, and the community attempting to involve all parties in neighborhood or school programs; to assist the Family Worker and Family Assistant in carrying out their

duties; and to attempt to involve community leaders to activly participate in Parent Advisory Councils concerning school programs. (PPA)

Monthly staff development sessions were to be held for Parent Involvement staff at rotated school sites in the district. These sessions were to be conducted by the parent program liaison. Family Workers and Assistants were to be mandated to maintain the weekly logs of their activities. The preservice train- period was to be devoted to establishing forms and form le' ers to disseminate to parent volunteers and to encourage eligible parents to participate in the parent involvement activities. Inservice training was to provide training to the following areas: referral processes, coordination of resources of the school and outside agencies; organization of parents as volunteers; evaluating activities, and tutorial techniques.

Evaluation

The Parent Involvement Component was implemented in September, 1978, in Community School District #23. Forty-four FW/FA have been assigned to each of the 20 schools in the district. Sixteen employed under Title I Early Childhood, and 28 employed under Title I Reading and Math Components. See table 13 for the proposed versus actual staff. A Parent Program Assistant, funded by the Parent Involvement Component has the specific duties of coordinating the Component. FW/FA have the following responsibilities within each school:

Academic Activities

FW/FA are assigned to components in their designated schools. They service components under which their positions are funded.

For example, FW/FA employed by Title I Early Childhood are assigned to service the component, while FW/FA employed by the Reading and Math Components are assigned to either of the two components. Students pulled out from class for behavior or health, or other reasons that prevent them from being in class, are sent to the Parent Involvement staff for limited remediation. Instructional materials provided by the Title I components are used in servicing of participating students. Title I staff have been providing onsite assistance to FW/FA in the use of materials with Title I students. FW/FA have the responsibility of escorting students referred to them, to visit the dentist, doctor or home for emergency reasons. They also conduct visits to the homes of participants in the program providing school assignments where there has been an extensive illness.

Parent/School Liaison Duties

In September, all principals were advised to send to the Parent Involvement staff in their school; lists of names and addresses of Title I eligible parents in order that the Parent Involvement staff may contact parents for participation in the component. Parents were contacted with the assistance of the School Advisory Councils (SAC) and invited to attend workshops in their child's respective school. Guest speakers are appearing at each school discussing topics such as the following: reading and math remediation for their children at home, consumer information, health services and arts and crafts demonstrations. All topics were designed to further stimulate the interest of Title I students so that parents would be encouraged to take active roles in the activities of their children's schools.

In a few schools parent rooms have been established, however, more schools must be encouraged to establish such rooms for parents. The Parent Program liaison has been effective in coordinating activities under the component. She attends workshops given at the schools and provides assistance to FW/FA in the contacting of resource persons for workshops. The Parent Program Assistant also disseminates information to parents relating to their children's educational needs. A list of participating parents at workshops held at each of the schools is also kept by her, as well as other records important to the functioning of the component. This person acts as a contact person between the schools and community. In as much as, this position involves a great deal of corresponding to community persons and agencies by phone and mail, it might be advantageous to fund an additional person under this component who would assist the Parent Program Assistant with her duties.

Monthly inservice workshops are being held for the FW/FA in the component by the Parent Program Assistant at the District Office. This is being done in coordination with the various Title I coordinators whose components the FW/FA are assigned.

In December 1978, the District's Parent's Advisory Committee approved the the dissemination to parents of a checklist of interests. It will be ascertained from the responses of parents on this checklist, their willingness to participate in various activity clusters. Hopefully, this will bring about an increased attendance at the various workshops which have been ranging from fair to good.

The Stanford Diagnostic Reading and Math Tests have been administered to Title I students as called for in the evaluation design. See Tables 8, 14, 15, and 16 for the evaluation designes. The posttest were administered as scheduled. After posttesting, data analysis was conducted to determine whether or not the children of the participating parents made significant achievement in reading and math.

SUMMARY

All schools contacted parents of Title I eligibles for attendance at monthly workshops. This year, it was the responsibility of the Parent Involvement staff at the various schools to contact parents of Title I eligible students for parent's participation in the component. This policy appeared to be effective. Attendance at the various workshops was fair to good, with some schools having above average attendance at the workshops. Schools where attendance in workshops was high were able to provide programs that made extra efforts to encourage parents to participate in the school. Principals in these schools showed a great deal of interest in the coordination of activities in these schools. In schools where there was minimal participation by principals, the Parent Program Assistant had a more arduous task in the coordination of the component. For example, it was important for all principals to submit lists of parent's names and addresses to Parent Involvement staff in each school. However, it took some schools a considerable amount of time to submit such lists. Moreover, this delay impaired the implementation of the program since workshops and activities could not take place until parents are contacted. The Parent Program Assistant reported that all such lists were in the possession of her staff.

She would, however, like to see more Principals take more active roles in the implementation of this component so such delays will no longer exist.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. In September all principals should disseminate to Parent Involvement staff lists with the names, addresses, phone numbers, of the parents of Title I eligible students.

2. An assistant or secretary should be hired to aid the Parent Program Assistant in the implementation of his/her responsibilities.